

second predicate by the side of Theos (God), as if Christ were first styled 'the great God,' and then 'Savior.' The article is omitted before 'Soterios', because the word is made definite by the Genitive 'hemon' (our), and the apposition precedes the proper name."

This remark about "hemon" led the writer to make an original and extended investigation, not merely in reference to the phrase "our Savior," but also to the much more numerous passages in which "our Lord" occurs. The result shows it to be a mistake to assert that the pronoun "our" supercedes the use of the article, as would be the case with an adjective. On the other hand, the article is always found in such phrases except in the very rare instances like Tit. 2: 13, where there is a special reason for its omission. Our investigation leads to the conclusion that there is no good reason for supposing a "careless construction," but that the apostle Paul carefully wrote just what he intended to say, as preceding context makes indisputable. If the "hemon" had been intended to belong to "soterios" simply, it must have had the article; but because it is omitted, the one article before "God" couples the two words together, making them apply alike to "Jesus Christ." The glory spoken of is that of Christ's second coming, and this is made more clear if the "kai" is taken as explanatory as it should be—"Looking for the blessed hope, even the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ."

The reason why the article must be used with "hemon" is perfectly simple. It is a personal pronoun, and the phrase would not be complete without it. The Greeks did not say "our Savior," but "the Savior of us." Similarly they said "the Lord of us," so that even when it occurs in Paul's oft repeated phrase, "our Lord Jesus Christ," it always has the article before Lord. But if "our" is omitted, "the Lord Jesus Christ" occurs regularly without the article. We find but one exception to the rule that "our" has the article preceding—in Gal. 1: 3, in the Revisers' text—but this is only an apparent exception for Westcott's text shows the "hemon" to be out of place. It reads regularly—"from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." It is strange that the revisers retained this reading of the "Textus Receptus" against Westcott and Hort in the face of the regular usage of the apostle. When Paul writes "the Lord Jesus Christ" (in independent position) it is always without the article, showing that in this case "Lord" was regarded as a title to the name, and so one with it.

But we are not dependent upon grammar or the rhetorical rules of language in this case. The clause "who gave himself for us" goes to show that the appearance in glory which is looked for is of the same person who gave himself for the redemption of the world. The preceding context makes this clear also, for verse 11 speaks of the first appearance of the Savior, and the connection with verse 10 shows that it is the same who is termed "our Savior-God." The words

"our Savior" come between the article and the noun, showing that they are used attributively, and therefore our Savior-God is a better rendering than "God our Savior," which takes Savior as in apposition. This same phrase occurs in chapter 1: 3, and chapter 3: 4. If there is any doubt that Paul means to assert that he received the "commandment" of his apostleship from Christ himself, the second quotation, from chapter three, makes it clear that the term Savior-God is applied to Christ, for it is he who "appeared" and "saved us." This would be a little more clearly brought out by observing the Greek order: "But when the kindness and philanthropy of our Savior-God appeared." This makes it a strict parallel to verse 11, ch. 2: "For the grace of God appeared," showing that the grace, kindness and love "appeared" in the appearance of the Savior. Moreover, he seems to be called "the saving God," for "soterios" is an adjective, and does not lend itself to the translation "bringing salvation." Since this adjective is masculine it must belong to God (Theou), after which it is placed. The Textus Receptus had an article (eta) before it, a feminine article, seeming to indicate that it belonged to "grace"—"the saving grace of God appeared"—but the critical text has removed this. The masculine adjective might agree with the feminine noun, provided it is employed as a personification of Christ, but the removal of the article removes the difficulty,—which the revisers seem not to have perceived. The term "Saving God" is apparently a strict parallel to "Savior-God." It is seen, therefore, that Christ is called God five times in the compass of this short epistle.

The phrase "God our Savior" occurs also in 1 Timothy 1: 1. We see no reason why this may not also apply to Christ like the same phrase in Titus, where "Christ Jesus our Savior," in the fourth verse, appears to indicate that the term is there applied to Christ. There is no difficulty about so applying it in 1 Tim. 1: 1; indeed, if the "kai" is taken as explanatory ("even"), "Christ Jesus our hope" is parallel with "God our Savior" and defines just what is meant. The American Revision has a marginal reference to Luke 1: 47, where Mary applies the term to God. There is no reason why it might not be applied to God the Father as is done in the Old Testament, but is it not a historical fact that Paul received his commission ("commandment") from Christ? It would seem therefore that Acts 9: 5, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" is a better reference to show who is indicated by the phrase in 1 Tim. 1: 1.

The same reference should be understood in 1 Tim. 2, 3, for it comports better with the succeeding context. Our Savior desires that "all men should be saved," by coming to the knowledge of the truth, "for God is one," and is therefore of one mind with the one Mediator who is a man with a man's feelings to sympathize with lost men.

There can be no doubt that Paul constantly thought of Christ Jesus as God, and that he constantly applies the names

of God to him. His word "Lord" is so used in all its varying phrases. What then are we to think of a set of revisers of Scripture who show a tendency to slur over this all important doctrine by translating so as to avoid as much as possible the application of the term God to our Savior? They have eliminated God from Acts 20: 28, having adopted the "badly attested reading." It is perhaps rightly eliminated from 1 Tim. 3: 16, but they have supplied an antecedent so that it is not perceived that the term "mystery of godliness" is applied to Christ directly, as the antecedent of the relative. They reject the word "God" from Jno. 1: 18, which Wescott and Hort insert in the text; while the ordinary reading is inserted in the margin as of "Western" origin, "having no sufficient intrinsic claim to any form of incorporation in the New Testament." It is not even given the dignity of an alternate reading. A version that does not deal fairly with the doctrine of the deity of Christ will hardly attain to general acceptance.

#### THE ASSEMBLY'S HOME AND SCHOOL.

To Pastors of Churches and Sunday School Superintendents.

How anxiously we look forward to the results of the collection for this cause on the last Sabbath in December. We are praying and hoping it will be the best in the history of the institution. We do not see how we can carry out our plans if at least \$25,000 is not contributed. \$15,000 for a meagre support and \$10,000 toward the purchase or erection of school buildings. The latter an absolute necessity as we have had a temporary contract for the last two years and this has come to an end. The Assembly recommends that this amount, \$25,000, be raised for the above purpose.

Brethren, we beg that you will come to the help of this worthy and needy cause. Think of it, when you contribute to it, you help the widow and the orphan of God's servants, who have fallen at their posts while preaching His blessed gospel and you help the missionary by educating his children while he preaches the gospel to the heathen. Let me again remind you that the work is not local. It belongs to our Assembly and is represented by nearly every Synod in the Assembly and by nearly all the foreign fields. It is an earnest call that we are making to you and in large measure it depends upon you. The money will come if you will place the matter before your people and urge a good contribution. Remember this is our only collection during the whole year and we are dependent solely upon the result. Such expressions as these come to us: "It would have been impossible for me to remain in the foreign field unless such an institution had been provided for my children's education." Think too of the widow with a family to support and educate. The Home and School is the channel by which and through which alone most of them can do this. Help us in this great work.

Send all contributions to S. W. Somerville, Fredericksburg, Va.